بِسْمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحْمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ

For him [i.e., each one] are successive [angels] before and behind him who protect him by the decree of Allāh. **Indeed, Allāh will not change the condition of a people until they change what is in themselves**. And when Allāh intends for a people ill, there is no repelling it. And **there is not for them besides Him any patron.**
Quran - 13:11

ASYMTOTIC REVOLUTION

A MANIFESTO

Servideus Weissman von Yavaria

(Versi Indonesia 90% DeepL: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Vnv5-nkqDhO63YRj0eoR2goEqWrgnXSw/edit?usp=drivesdk&ouid=115126953384349401691&rtpof=true&sd=true)

(Site Version: slightly More refined Servideus Writing - Asymptotic Manifesto)

(Rough Core Idea: A struggle of reality.docx)

• Introduction

This is a manifesto, which derived from the novel framework of Divine Dialectical Asymptoticism. The Framework will never be complete, as the writer is still learning and developing it. It is a fusion of:

- Mathematical Incompleteness (Gödel)
- Dialectical refinement (Hegel, Marx)
- Islamic epistemology (Al-Ghazali, Sufi thought)
- Postmodern critique (Foucault, Lacan, Žižek)
- Revolutionary strategy (Trotsky, Popper, anti-authoritarianism)

Its unique contribution is the application of structured-incompleteness to governance, ethics, and ideology, creating a perpetual dialectical system that prevents stagnation while maintaining stability.

I. Glossary

- **The Universal:** A necessary external framework that grounds all knowledge, whether theological or secular. It can also mean The theistic conception of ultimate truth, as experienced in revelation.
- **Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem:** A mathematical proof stating that no sufficiently complex system can be both complete and self-justified. In DDE, this supports the necessity of structured-incompleteness.
- **Structured-Incompleteness:** The idea that all human knowledge and systems must remain open-ended, self-revising, and never claim finality.

- **Asymptotic Justice:** Justice can never be fully captured by human institutions but can be approached indefinitely through continuous refinement.
- **Parasitic Systems:** Socioeconomic or political systems that rely on oppression, coercion, or deception to sustain themselves, making them inherently unstable.
- **Ethical Universality:** The notion that justice and morality are not subjective but must align with sustainability and long-term stability.
- **Dialectical Occasionalism:** A dynamic approach to contradictions, where their resolution is not predetermined but unfolds through engagement with reality.

- **Gödelian Constitution:** A legal framework that embeds structured-incompleteness, ensuring no law or system can be absolute or immune to revision.
- **Hierarchical Democracy:** A governance model where political influence is weighted based on awareness and rational capability rather than mere popularity.
- **Dialectical Governance:** A form of rule that institutionalizes self-correction, critique, and ideological refinement as core functions of the state.
- **Political Awareness Tests:** Evaluations that measure an individual's level of understanding in order to calibrate their influence in decision-making.

- **Modes of Reaction to the Universal:**
  - **Progress:** Refining one's ideology to better align with truth.
  - **Stagnation:** Holding onto an outdated worldview without evolution.
  - **Regression:** Actively moving away from truth to protect an illusion.
  - **Self-Annihilation:** Mystical transcendence beyond all ideological attachments.
- **Jouissance (Lacan/Zizek):** A paradoxical form of pleasure derived from reinforcing illusions, often at the expense of real progress.

- **Asymptotic Revolution:** A movement of perpetual critique and refinement, preventing ideological stagnation and ensuring progress toward justice.
- **Dialectical Rupture:** The inevitable point at which contradictions within an unjust system accumulate, forcing either reform or collapse.
- **Contradiction Acceleration:** The strategic revelation of systemic flaws to increase public awareness and force change.
- **Revolutionary Co-optation:** When a movement is absorbed by the existing power structure and neutralized, preventing real change.

● Preambule

In an era where ideological stagnation, political dogmatism, and systemic oppression dominate human civilization, the Asymptotic Revolution emerges as a call for perpetual refinement. No system, whether religious, political, or philosophical, can claim finality. Truth, justice, and governance are not fixed destinations but infinite pursuits—approachable yet never fully attainable.

Grounded in structured-incompleteness, this manifesto challenges the illusion of absolute certainty. Inspired by Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem, Hegelian dialectics, and Islamic epistemology, it asserts that every institution must embed self-correction, ensuring continuous progress without falling into authoritarianism or ideological rigidity.

The path forward is not through static solutions but through perpetual revolution, where contradictions are confronted, critiques institutionalized, and justice refined without end. This is not merely a theory of governance but a framework for human evolution—an unyielding ascent toward the Universal.

Let no law be immune to critique. Let no power be above refinement. Let no ideology declare itself final. Let not even this manifesto shall declare itself complete, except for the law that no law shall be immune to critique; for the rule of incompleteness is a Divine Law.

II. Epistemological Foundation

A. Direct vs. Reflected Knowledge

Distinguishing divine revelation from human interpretation.

Every knowledge in regard to the truth is categorized by two: direct and reflected. Direct are where God unveils himself to whom he wills, and reflected are all of our interpretations in regard to the Truth with a medium. It is our knowledge and ethics in regards to the Universal. This medium can be imagined as a mirror. Now, Now, for Muslims, every mirror there is, is flawed, because they cannot encapsulate the divine in totality, so no matter how much, we can only try to refine it. It is different from the Perfect Mirror that the Prophet had delivered, but despite its partiality in regard to the Truth, it is a perfect mirror (al-Ghazali).

B. The Mirror Analogy

How different traditions refine their understanding of truth.

For Muslim, it is a flawed mirror, that is facing a perfect mirror (Islamic Revelation, core tenets of Islam), that is facing the divine. They look at what the Revelation has said, and then try to deduce their meaning by rational and empirical attempt. Does this mean Shariah and religious law should always be open to dialectical reinterpretation? Only their application. the Core tenets of Religion cannot be changed. The Perfect mirror cannot be changed by a less perfect mirror; but a less perfect mirror can still be improved asymptotically. The Perfect Mirror is the revelation, and the less perfect are our knowledge of said Perfect mirror.

For the atheist alike, they refine their mirror in accordance to what's reverberated from what their work is. If a form of justice is better than another form, then it is what is considered better to them. For them, how to refine their mirror is by empirical and rational evidence.

Between Theists and Secular, there's no antagonism of their way of reaching the truth, except that one side believes in God, and one is Skeptical. The analogy is that one side tries to be healthy by listening to the doctor and eating pills from what they had prescribed, and the other is trying and making every medicine there is, skeptical of the doctor, to get themselves healthy. Both sides will get healthy if they do a ‘correct’ algorithmic act in which they are aligned with Human Biology (e.g. every dehydration is solved with Drinking water, etc). That is because health is an universal concept in which they result in the same way if they follow the same algorithm. Similarly, a justice will result in sustainability regardless of which sides

they are coming from, if they follow a rule; because Justice, Goodness, and all, are an Universal in which they cannot be encapsulated into the human system, but are able to be approached indefinitely: asymptotically.

C. The Divine/Universal Reference Point (DRP/URP)

Epistemic universality as a necessity.

Truth is not subjective; Even for Secularists, skepticism presupposes truth. Gödel's incompleteness theorem suggests that no system can be entirely self-justified—this means: Any model of reality requires an external reference point to define itself; Even relativism needs a universal frame to function (e.g., "all perspectives are relative" is a universal claim); The scientific method relies on universality—if laws of physics changed arbitrarily, science would collapse; Mathematical consistency suggests an underlying structure—Pi, Euler's identity, and prime numbers exist regardless of cultural belief. There is an underlying structure to reality, and knowledge must conform to it, making epistemic universality unavoidable.

If justice were purely subjective, then any system could justify oppression under the guise of moral relativism. However, justice is measurable: Systems that minimize harm and maximize well-being tend to last longer and be more stable; Societies that engage in self-destruction through injustice collapse (e.g., Rome, feudal France, late-stage capitalism). If a system needs violence, coercion, or deception to sustain itself, then it is parasitic (requiring oppression to survive). A truly just system does not require subjugation to function—it sustains itself. Cooperation yields better long-term results than pure self-interest (Game Theory). Ethical universals arise because they produce stable, non-exploitative societies. Justice is universal because unjust systems are self-terminating, requiring oppression to survive.

For the Theists, one must conform to God, therefore, it is an obligation of oneself to align with these Universality of justice. For the Secularist, There is justification for universalism that aligns with both empirical reality and rational necessity, without requiring divine revelation. However, it remains compatible with theological views, since these principles do not contradict religious belief but instead justify universality in a way that even skeptics must accept.

D. Gödel's Incompleteness & Epistemic Limits

No system is self-justified; all knowledge must refer to an external structure.

The reason why our knowledge is inherently incomplete, is because humans need a medium for them to actualize Justice. That medium is Language, Logic, Mathematics, etc. In Gödel's theorem, he had proved that the possibility of humans to ever 'complete' its system is an impossibility. That is because, there's a structured incompleteness in which every formalized system cannot encapsulate or account for all things there is: there must be something Outside of the system for it to sustain itself, with all of these contradictions. That is the reason why, every Ideology there is inherently incomplete, and it manifests in different kinds of oppression; in which it is structured, not accidental (Zizek).

III. The Nature of Justice & Ethics

A. Justice as a Universal Principle

Ethical universality and the self-terminating nature of unjust systems.

Any truth claim or system must be evaluated by its ability to sustain itself: Capitalism requires infinite growth → leads to environmental collapse → unsustainable; Empires require endless expansion → lead to overextension and decline → unsustainable; Ecological balance is necessary for human survival, meaning environmental justice is not just moral but structural; Social cohesion is necessary for functioning societies, making oppression a self-defeating mechanism; Any system that ignores reality (e.g., denying climate change) will collapse under its contradictions; A universal truth must hold across different conditions without requiring force to sustain itself. What is sustainable is universal—truth, justice, and ethics must conform to this law.

B. Sustainability as a Criterion for Truth

Now, a flawed mirror can decay or stagnate, because there cannot be a totalized system of knowledge to encapsulate The Divine. But there's a way to see the flaw. Since truth is just, it must be just; conversely, falsehood must be unjust, and somehow oppress a thing to survive: it needs them. It is parasitic in nature, oppressing what is on their surroundings, while the truth is sustainable in itself, just like God. A falsehood is dependent upon something else other than God to sustain itself. Therefore, When analyzing a system, one must seek its contradiction: which variable that is missed out, or what is the thing that has been oppressed somewhere? The Nature of Truth is that it is Just, so in contrast, falsehood should be unjust. A distortion in our mirror can be known by looking at these mentioned variables. So for example, in Capitalist countries, the falsehood can be seen within the oppression it had: the poor and the worker. In Totalitarian Socialist countries (e.g. China), it is the People by the Party using justification of 'We Are the True Communists'; in Totalitarian Theocratic Countries (e.g. ISIS), it is the marginalized and reformist, and sometimes the People itself, under the justification of ' I Am the divine' or 'We are the one who are Divinely Guided'. Or even if we take a look into the nature of Human itself, it is the Ego in which its oppressed the true Self within us, causing destruction of our rational power, alienation of spirituality, all for the sake of fulfilling an Ego; making the subject believing that without the Ego, Man won't be able to find his 'true Self', in reality, the there's a clear distinction between the Ego (nafs) and the individuality that receives the Grace of god and are able to choose its own master. Their oppression; Government or Self, is not by accident, but rather it is an intentional and inherent design in which a subject is shaped by their own choices.

C. The Necessity of Self-Correction

No ideology or system can claim finality.

Just as no mathematical system is complete, no ideology, government, or worldview can be final. Self-correcting structures outperform rigid structures: Scientific progress happens because it assumes refinement, not finality; Societies that allow critique and evolution are more stable than authoritarian ones; Universality must be self-correcting → Any claim of absolute ideological finality is false because it contradicts the structure of reality. A universal framework must be open-ended and continuously refine itself.

IV. The Dialectical Model of Human Development

A. Human Modes of Reaction to the Universal

There are four modes of Human reaction to the Universal and their Illusion that is ideology or worldview. Progress, is when a subject react to the Universal and works to refine their Ideology to better aligned with it; Stagnation, is when one complicit in the different between the Universal and their Ideology, still upholds their Illusion or Ideology without refinements; Regression, is when a Subject deliberately move away from the Universal to upholds their Ideology, not aligned with it; and Self-Annihilation, is when the subject remove all of form of attachment to Ideology, including one's Ego, to directly experience the Universal itself; we won't delve deep into this for now. For regression, it often occurs from a stagnation of a subject. That is because, contradiction will accumulate and it will force the subject to either align with the Universal, or strengthen the illusion or its ideology. Problems will eventually accumulate in a subject, in which it may result in a Jouissance of a subject; an incomplete act to satisfy an excess desire that appeared on a subject, to cover their illusion (Zizek-Lacan). It is inherently incomplete, because after the act has been done, the lingering desire is still not satisfied after a subject tries to erase it with an incomplete means of pleasure. The Self-Annihilation mode, Sufis, for example, transcend this with asceticism in which they let go all of the attachment to satisfy their desire; but the Experience itself cannot be transferred to other people. After Sufi get this experience, they will be unable to describe their experience in total, because they are limited by Human Medium to share their information; and the medium is inherently incomplete.

B. The History of Nations in Our Lens

Take a look at the government then; when a Government refuses to ignore a problem within its subject, the contradiction will accumulate. For example, because the government didn't care enough for the economic stability, there'll be a recession, the risk of failing education, homelessness, etc. All of this would lead to a rupture if a government refuses to acknowledge the problem. The rupture will force the government to face their problem directly, harming their illusion of control, and choose between regress or progress. Progress is acknowledgement of the problem, while Regress meant choosing to strengthen their illusion and control: further totalitarian state that silences critique, and all of that. All of which, the subject will repeatedly be forced to choose between Progress or Regress, as they will see a real threat in front of them because of accumulated problems. It would result in further problem and contradiction, and In the end of it, when the problem becomes too much, it would leads to a destruction of themselves: either by violent revolts (e.g. French revolution), or collapse of an entire system (e.g. USSR). But these violent revolts are not without its limitations: some revolution can only replace the authoritarian state with another oppressive regime, just more subtly (e.g. Iraq), or that it can lead to something better (the Meccan Liberation). These ruptures also can be influenced by outside power, like in the case of American Middle easts and things like that. This also happens in a Human, where they'll either choose to regress or progress, in relation to what reaction they choose when they are faced with a problem. Do they serve their Ego, or follow the voice of reason and transform their worldview to something better? Each had their own results. The Choices itself are available for every subject to choose from; but not its consequences.

In general, there are two choices available to every subject when faced with an existing contradiction, or an existing reality. First, the subject will respond to the contradiction with dialectics: face the problem, acknowledge it, try to abandon their illusion of control, and grow to be better. The second reaction, they will remain stubborn to the Illusion they hold, not acknowledge the existing problem, and actually increase the contradiction in the system. The choice is only to add to the problem, or reduce it. Of course, there is a trade-off in it. When the Subject chooses to grow, then the consequence is that he must destroy the old illusions and perspectives he carries and rebuild them. When the subject chooses otherwise, then the consequence is that the contradiction will grow and the level of chaos will become more intense. We can see this in the story of Pharaoh. In it, Pharaoh, with his illusion that He is the all-powerful God, is faced with the reality When Moses AS came, to change his illusory view. At first, the signs or contradictions that appeared and were faced in front of Pharaoh were small, such as Reprimands, Invitations, and discussions. However, as Pharaoh refused to acknowledge the contradiction and continued to cling to his illusion, he was presented with stronger evidence of the contradiction: the miracle of Moses turning his staff into a snake, a glowing hand, and so on. There was even a time when his country was hit by a disaster of raining frogs and insects, which caused a pandemic. In the end, when the contradiction was so strong, because many of Pharaoh's followers turned away from him and turned to Moses, Pharaoh was presented with a stronger contradiction. In this case, Pharaoh would have repented and destroyed his illusion, but he preferred to hold on to his illusion and impose his will: increasing his authoritarian oppression of the Israelites. So, because the contradiction was so great, Pharaoh drowned when he tried to kill the prophet Moses and his followers. In this case, Pharaoh failed to dialectically and grow to the truth, and he was destroyed because of the magnitude of the contradiction.

There's a state where a flaw is permissible by its subject, like in the case of American Capitalism or Nazi Germany where the subject is complacent in their oppression and seeing it as a truth, Continuously oppressing others with conscious or unconscious action. Here, the contradictions carried out by the state are in line with what the people want. In this case, even though there are accumulated contradictions, stagnation will continue to emerge and over time, the illusion of perfection covers the entire organism of society. In this case, the establishment of a society is very dependent on a very fragile illusion and mandatory oppression. Since the Illusion requires another subject to be oppressed, in this case, if the subject of oppression is fighting against the existing system, or has lost its value, then the system will lose its foundation and force the subject to find a new form of oppression. In this case, a system maintains its Stagnation.

Let's take America for example. In its capitalist system, they change from one form of oppression to another. At the beginning, forced slavery, then worker exploitation, then to Mental exploitation. In this final phase, as in Byung-chul, oppression no longer comes from outside, but from within the subject. There is a harmony of motivation to maintain the Illusion between the State and its Subject, and this makes the system stagnant, until it will be faced with a new reality if there is an organism with greater power in Foucault's language.

If capitalism always finds a way to adapt to forms of oppression, how can it ever be completely destroyed? Will there be a point where the system runs out of ways to

adapt, or will there always be new forms of exploitation? A system, or society in this case as the subject of ideological players, will never complete its oppression or narrative. In this regard, Zizek says that every system or ideology is inherently imperfect. And that imperfection is actualized into forms of oppression. So, in this case, the capitalist system is not 'transformed' completely; even if that transition is to become Socialism. To use Hegel's words, the replacement of the fruit bud with the fruit is indeed different in content, but it is a form of transformation that cannot be separated. The goal is not to destroy the system itself and replace it, but rather, to point out the contradictions that exist and try to fix them incrementally. What distinguishes the illusion in American/Chinese capitalism from the illusions of other countries that eventually collapse? It will be the inconsistency between the Regime and the consciousness of society, which causes revolutions like the French.

In other cases the flaw that is maintained by the system are incompatible with its subject that has realized the flaw and wanting to change it like in French Revolution; there's a state where both the ruler and its subject understand the flaw and works on it, like in the case of Nordic History from Feudalism towards Social Democracy without a violent revolts; and there's also a state where it tried to work towards the justice but its subject are compliant in illusion. For the latter case it can be seen in The Late Stage Islamic Caliphate, where the ruler wants to make a better rule, yet its subject is already in stagnation because 'We are already perfect because of Islam.'. In this way, the Rashidun Caliphate regressed into the Umayyads and then all of its history. All of which is determined by the nature of the Human themselves, in which way they are reacting to the Universal. A flawed mirror can be changed, but it depends on Human choices.

Now in the case of Indonesia, this kind of asymptotic dialectic occurs in various cases. The overthrow of Soekarno driven by Washington, the overthrow of Soeharto by students but still driven by the oligarchy, the overthrow of Gus Dur due to the lack of public awareness, and so on. So, this kind of dialectical process is not only initiated by the contradiction itself, but also the subjects playing in it. When a contradiction is not known (or does not want to be known) by civil society, then the change that occurs is not in the name of the people, but another power, which realistically, does seem more 'fair' and stable, but is still oppressive, although more subtle. In this case, all forms of change do not occur deterministically, but depend on the subjects involved. In this case, Foucault might analyze that the exchange of Power occurs in the process of changing a system. In the case of a revolution driven by someone other than the people themselves (a revolution from outside), the Power or Consciousness possessed by the people's subjects is less, compared to the Consciousness possessed by foreign subjects. So, in this case, the system grows to the desires of foreign subjects rather than by the subjects of the country's own people. We can see this, for example, in every regime overthrow in Indonesia. In the overthrow of Soekarno, the revolution was driven by America because the people's understanding of politics at that time was still minimal; in the overthrow of Soeharto, although it looked like a mass action movement, it was still led by the oligarchy and military regime, because their awareness was much stronger than the era that had been castrated by the Soeharto regime. In the case of the overthrow of Gus Dur, there was indeed an awareness to defend Gus Dur, but only among a very limited group, namely the Nahdliyyin, who lost against the great power coordinated by the oligarchy and the former party from the Soeharto era. The people here are oppressed because they do not have sufficient awareness. Contradiction itself does not bring change:

There must be a subject who reacts to the existing contradiction. In this case, awareness and repeated destruction of illusions are needed in order to reach a stronger level of statehood. Indonesia's weakness is that the common trend among the Indonesians is anti-intellectualism, or the power itself. According to postmodernism analysis, if the subject actively seeks to make himself ignorant, fighting against knowledge itself, then of course they will be eaten by those who have higher intelligence. So, change does not only come from hope or resignation, but must be fought for with full awareness.

Contradictions do not destroy a system—stubbornness does.

C. Analyzing Contradiction within Government

Now, if we take a look at the system of Government; all of this imperfection can be analyzed through different tools like in Marxism, Postmodernism, Islamic criticism, and all other tools of Critique; All for the sake of refining our mirror. There can't be a limitation of what tools should be used, but rather, in how we are using it. A tools is merely a tool, and cannot be used as a justification or an end point, like in the case of Perverse Marxism where a state deny any attempt at reform just because the deterministic nature of its source (Karl Marx), or that Postmodern too in its relativistic nature that offers no viable alternatives, and in turns directed themselves into Nihilism. One tool cannot be used as a Total System to reflect on things, since every system there is, despite pointing at an insight of what Justice is, cannot encapsulate it fully. It must be emphasized that the use of all analytical and critical systems must be used to analyze the flaw in our progress as a human, both epistemic or Ethical progress.

What we want is a state of perpetual refinement and critique, so that we will align ourselves more with the universal. So we call for action, a movement which takes a perpetual revolution towards the Universal as its basis. A call that we named: Dialectical Asymptoticism.

V. Structured-Incompleteness & Institutional Reform

A. Gödelian Constitutional Framework

No law immune to critique.

How to ensure that ideological communities do not become authoritarian once in power? How to avoid fragmentation after the initial victory, where united groups begin to clash over ideological differences? How to ensure that internal criticism remains alive without becoming an excuse for stagnation or the downfall of the new system? By forcing the constitution to make structured-incompleteness the basis of the system. If there is dialectic between groups after winning, then it is natural for the state. But the strongest groups are those who are willing to learn. In a society where Asymtoticism is the basis, the sign of weakness is a dogmatic and totalitarian system.

System imperfections must be explicitly stated and present at the base of every sector of government. The education system, the economy, and so on. In every policy formulation or development agency, there must be a sentence like Godel's arithmetic

clearly stated for the small community to criticize. What we proposed is to implement Gödellian Verse explicitly into the constitution and every policy and/or establishment there is, to maintain their status as incomplete and can be refined each time; and that That status cannot be removed, as its removal would mean a direct assault to the foundation of every system. We want a state of perpetual refinement and critique, so that we will align ourselves more with the universal. There must be a Meta-Clause against Dogmatism– "No law shall declare itself immune to critique, except the law that no law shall be immune to critique; If this law is removed, the constitution is void and must be rewritten from scratch—by an independent public assembly."

Gödel's Constitutional Concept in Asymptoticism is a constitution that is inherently open, non-absolute, and always open to criticism and renewal. The term is taken from Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem, which states that in a sufficiently complex formal system:

1. There are statements that are true but cannot be proven within the system itself.

2. A completely consistent system cannot prove its own consistency.

Applied to politics, this means that no system of government can be truly perfect or final, so constitutions must be built with mechanisms that allow for ongoing criticism, revision, and internal dialectics.

Gödel's Constitutional Principles

1. Structured Incompleteness
   The constitution must contain mechanisms that recognize that laws and systems of government are always open to revision.
   No law can be considered absolute and unchangeable, except for the basic principles that guarantee the dialectic itself.
   This system avoids stagnation by preventing legal dogmatism and ensuring political flexibility.

2. Dialectical and Evolutionary Law
   Laws and policies must always have a periodic evaluation mechanism.
   If a policy creates a major contradiction in society, the constitution must provide a fast and responsive revision path. This legal system is not just a fixed rule, but a system that evolves along with public awareness.

3. Distribution of Power Based on Consciousness
   Leadership in this system is not based on popularity or oligarchy, but based on the level of awareness (proximity to the Universal).
   Democracy still exists, but there is an intellectual hierarchy where those with deeper understanding are given greater responsibility.
   Political Schools and Democracy Awareness Tests are the main instruments in ensuring competent leadership.

4. Transparency and Public Participation Based on Dialectics

All policies must have a philosophical justification, not just legalistic or pragmatic. The constitution must provide a mechanism that allows the public to challenge policies without having to go through a destructive revolution. People's forums and dialectic councils should be established to continuously assess the direction of state policy.

5. Anti-Stagnation and Anti-Authoritarianism Mechanisms
   If a regime begins to stagnate or become authoritarian, the constitution should have automatic protocols that allow for systemic intervention. No leader should be allowed to come to power without regular evaluation. If they fail to maintain dialectic or shut down criticism, they should be able to be replaced through legitimate mechanisms. The constitution should explicitly prohibit the freezing of dialectic, whether in the form of censorship, repression, or dogmatization of state ideology.

How is Gödel's Constitution Implemented?

1. Every Law Must Contain Gödel Arithmetic
   In every public policy, there must be a clause that allows for review based on emerging contradictions. There must be objective indicators that show when a policy fails and must be changed. If a policy creates stagnation or serious contradictions, there must be an automatic revision mechanism.

2. Compulsory and Free Political Education System
   The public must be given full access to political education, so that they are not oppressed by elites who monopolize consciousness.
   Every citizen has the right to receive political education that allows them to understand and challenge the system if necessary.

3. Separation of Subject and Ideology
   The state must not monopolize ideological narratives and must always be open to dialectical challenges. Criticism of individuals or groups must not be equated with treason against the state. The system must prevent the emergence of an ideological oligarchy that closes off the space for debate.

4. Periodic Evaluation of Leaders and Institutions
   All leaders and public officials should be periodically evaluated based on their level of contribution to the dialectic.
   If they are found to be trying to freeze the system or stifle criticism, they should be able to be removed through constitutional mechanisms.
   The bureaucracy should have the flexibility to evolve, not become a barrier to change.

Why is a Gödel Constitution Necessary?

1. Prevents Stagnation as Occurs in Capitalism and Authoritarian States
   This system is not like capitalism, which merely manages contradictions without resolving them. Authoritarian states collapse because they reject dialectics—a

Gödel Constitution keeps criticism alive without completely destroying the system.

2. Avoids Destructive Revolutions
   History shows that revolutions are often usurped by foreign powers or new elites who are just as bad as the old ones. A Gödel Constitution creates a path for internal change that prevents the need for bloody revolutions.

3. Ensures the State Continues to Progress Toward the Universal
   This system ensures that the state will never become complacent or claim to have achieved absolute truth. This constitution keeps the dialectic going, ensuring that the state is always moving toward greater justice.

Gödel's constitution in the Asymptoticism is a system that ensures continuous change without losing stability. It rejects stagnation, rejects dogma, and is always open to criticism. With its structured-incompleteness, it ensures that the political and social system can always develop without the need for destructive revolutions. This system not only builds a dynamic state, but also brings society closer to the Universal by ensuring that the dialectic is always alive.

B. Hierarchical Democracy

Weighing political influence based on awareness and rational capacity.

Democracy must give different voices according to the level of consciousness present in the individual, so that hypocrites do not have a voice to consolidate lower subjects attacking those closer to the Universal. The playing field must be fair, so that the hypocrites fight against the more righteous, and separate their influence from that of the people who have less knowledge. The strong must serve the Weak; but their rule must be evaluated regularly, and the State must ensure that everyone can be strong within this system. Dialectic must be kept alive among the people, but those who are chosen by decentralized criterion and democracy lead from one hierarchy to another, and give direction on how the state should run. In dealing with hypocrites, Dialectic can be a weapon to get to the root of their motivations. In this case, because people's consciousness is also stratified, the power in society is also stratified if we borrow Foucault.

Conventional democracy often faces the paradox of egalitarianism, where the voices of those who lack sufficient political awareness or insight carry the same weight as those who have developed a deep understanding. Hierarchical Democracy aims to avoid irrational populism without falling into elitist oligarchy.

Principles of Hierarchical Democracy

1. Equality of Political Rights Based on Awareness, Not Populism
   Every citizen has political rights, but the weight of their influence in government is determined by their level of awareness. The higher a person's awareness of dialectics, justice, and the Universal, the greater their influence in the decision-

making process. This prevents the masses who are easily manipulated by populism or propaganda from making decisions that damage the system.

2. Political Schools and Democracy Awareness Tests
   Political Schools are mandatory for all citizens so that they have sufficient understanding before participating in government. Democracy Awareness Tests determine how much influence a person has in elections and public policy. It is not that those who fail the test lose their right to vote, but their votes carry less weight than those who have demonstrated a higher level of consciousness.

3. Dynamic and Dialectical Hierarchical Structure
   The hierarchy in this system is not static, but can change based on a person's level of consciousness.
   There is no permanent political caste—one can move up or down in the political structure based on periodic evaluations of one's contributions and consciousness.
   This system ensures that only those who are able to understand and manage social contradictions are at the top of the government.

4. Gödel's Constitution as a Foundation
   This government structure is bound by Gödel's Constitution, which ensures that no leader or group can monopolize power without criticism and evaluation.
   If a group begins to show authoritarian or stagnant tendencies, an internal dialectical mechanism ensures that their power can be corrected or revoked.

5. Dialectical-Based Accountability Mechanism
   All leaders, from local to national, must be accountable for their decisions to the Dialectical Council, which serves as an ethical and intellectual watchdog. Open criticism and debate must be guaranteed and facilitated, not prohibited. Law should not be used as a tool of repression, but as a tool to ensure a balance between stability and change.

Hierarchical Democratic Structure in Asymtoticism

1. People (Dialectical Subject)
   All citizens have political rights, but must go through adequate political education before they can participate fully.
   Those who are more aware and active in social dialectics have greater influence in elections and policy-making.

2. Dialectical Council
   Functions as a check and balance of power, ensuring that every policy is in line with the dialectic towards the Universal.
   This council consists of individuals who have demonstrated the highest level of political awareness and ethics, selected through a selection process based on competence and awareness, not just popularity.

3. Government Based on Periodic Evaluation
   Every official and leader must be evaluated periodically to ensure that they remain loyal to the principles of dialectics. Every subject that is willing to have a higher vote should also fall under these evaluations.
   If they are proven to be stagnant or abusing power, they can be removed without the need for a destructive revolution.

4. Institutionalized Public Criticism Forum
   The state must ensure that criticism and discussion are not only permitted but also required. There must be regular mechanisms where policies can be publicly debated by those who have reached a certain level of awareness.

How Can Hierarchical Democracy Avoid Elitism and Oligarchy?

1. Access to Political Education Should Be Free and Universal
   There should be no barriers for people to raise their awareness.
   Political education is not just a right, but an obligation for every citizen.

2. Flexible and Evaluation-based Hierarchical Structure
   If someone has high consciousness but tries to consolidate power authoritatively, they can be brought down through a dialectical mechanism. There is no 'permanent elite' as the hierarchy is always subject to change based on periodic testing and evaluation.

3. Stratified but Inclusive Democracy (Foucault)
   Those at lower levels of consciousness still have political rights, but with less influence than those who are more conscious. This prevents the chaos of populism but still respects the principle of inclusiveness.

4. Balance between Stability and Change
   The system does not allow for political stagnation as every leader and policy is subjected to a periodic dialectical test.
   If someone fails to maintain their position in the system, they will automatically be replaced by a more sober individual.

Hierarchical Democracy in Asymptoticism is a system that maintains the principles of openness and public participation, but avoids the weaknesses of liberal democracy that are easily manipulated by populism and hidden oligarchy.

This system ensures that only those who have a high awareness of dialectics and justice have a great influence in decision-making. However, this system remains inclusive by giving every individual the opportunity to increase their awareness and rise in the political hierarchy.

This system also ensures that the state continues to develop dialectically, avoiding stagnation, while preventing destructive revolutions that are often controlled by external forces.

C. Knowledge as Universal Right

Because there's a need for Hierarchical Democracy, the pursuit of Knowledge must become an universal right for everyone to participate in. It cannot be a commodity to be hoarded by elites, nor a privilege granted by authority—it must be an universal right, fundamental to human liberation and the pursuit of justice. Without access to knowledge and the ability to refine it, societies fall into ideological stagnation, authoritarianism, and systemic oppression.

1. Knowledge as an Ethical and Structural Necessity
   Truth is asymptotic, meaning no individual or institution can claim absolute knowledge, but all must have the right to approach it indefinitely.
   A just society does not impose knowledge from above but ensures that all people have access to refine, challenge, and expand it. The right to knowledge is not just about access—it is about the ability to question, critique, and refine truth.
2. The Gödelian Principle: No Knowledge is Immune to Critique
   No interpretation of ideology, religion, science, or law can declare itself final—all must remain open to revision. A Gödelian Constitutional Framework ensures that knowledge remains structurally incomplete, preventing dogmatism and epistemic tyranny. Educational institutions, religious authorities, and political leaders must be subjected to continuous dialectical evaluation.
3. The Duty of a Just Society: Ensuring Universal Access to Knowledge
   To establish knowledge as a universal right, a society must:
   - Guarantee free and universal education, ensuring that no one is barred from learning due to economic, social, or political conditions.
   - Institutionalize Public Criticism Forums, allowing every citizen to challenge government policies, scientific claims, and ideological narratives.
   - Ensure transparency and prevent knowledge monopolies, so that information is never controlled by corporations, religious oligarchies, or authoritarian regimes.
4. Hierarchical Awareness vs. Elitism
   While all individuals have the right to knowledge, those with higher awareness and dialectical ability should help refine governance. Political Awareness Tests ensure that decision-making is guided by competency rather than mass manipulation. True knowledge-based governance does not create an elite class—it empowers all individuals to develop their awareness.
5. The Asymptotic Pursuit of Knowledge
   Knowledge is not static, and no society should assume it has reached the peak of understanding. All philosophies, religions, sciences, and governance structures must be perpetually refined. A society that ceases to refine knowledge descends into decay; a society that continuously pursues knowledge moves toward justice and sustainability.

A truly free and just society does not merely allow knowledge—it demands its constant expansion and refinement. Without the right to knowledge, humanity is condemned to oppression, illusion, and stagnation. But with structured-incompleteness embedded into its foundation, society ensures that knowledge remains an ever-expanding force of liberation**.**

Truth is not to be owned, but sought. Knowledge is not to be dictated, but refined. Let no institution claim finality, for the pursuit of knowledge is infinite.

VI. The Asymptotic Revolution

A. Perpetual Refinement & Critique

Preventing ideological stagnation.

We want to Keep the Revolution Progressive, Not Just Managing Contradictions Revolution is not only about replacing rulers but about continuing to open up space for awareness and social change. If the new system begins to form new illusions that hinder progress (and it will certainly come), the revolution must correct itself again. Perpetual Revolution is a must, as we have to move towards the Universal, asymptotically.

B. Resistance Against Oppressive Systems

If the dialectic can be accelerated by human choice, how to create conditions where more humans choose to accelerate change? Is there a strategy to raise collective consciousness without resorting to coercion or propaganda that creates new illusions? Echo the revolution, from one side to the other. Form power with consciousness. To borrow Foucault, power can be shared by spreading awareness. The best way is to highlight the contradictions within the system. And if the subject's reaction is oppression, then the material contradictions will be more available to the oppressed. The oppressed must intensify the visibility of contradictions.

Changes to oppressive systems within the framework of Asymptoticism must be carried out dialectically, strategically, and measurably, not just spontaneous revolutions that are often exploited by external forces or produce new systems that are equally oppressive.

1. Identifying Contradictory Points in the System
   Oppressive systems persist because there is an illusion of stability that is maintained by repression or propaganda. To accelerate change, it is necessary to:
   - Reveal the contradictions of the system by showing the inconsistency between the narrative of power and the reality of the people.
   - Spread awareness of the contradictions so that society no longer accepts the status quo as something natural.

   Examples:

   Using alternative media and intellectual movements to show the difference between government claims (for example, "stable country") and the reality on the ground (poverty, injustice, corruption). If the system uses religious narratives to justify oppression, it needs to be deconstructed through stronger theological arguments.

2. Forming a Network of Awareness and Coordination
   Change will not happen if awareness is only at the individual or small group level. It is necessary to build a coordinating network that:
   - Connects various opposition groups in one big narrative that targets the main contradictions.

- Avoids internal fragmentation by agreeing on common goals, although strategies may vary.
- Uses religious communities, intellectuals, and activists as coordination centers.

Strategy:

- Utilizes civil society organizations (CSOs), intellectual communities, or religious groups to build awareness without having to move frontally which is easily repressed.
- If the state controls the media, use alternative networks (samizdat, dark web, independent media, international networks) to disseminate information.

3. Disrupting the Illusion of Legitimacy
   Oppressive systems persist because people believe they have no alternative or that change would be worse than the status quo. This can be broken down by:
   - Attacking the legitimacy narrative of power by exposing the system's lies and hypocrisies.
   - Creating credible alternative scenarios, not just empty rhetoric.

   Techniques:

   - If the state claims to be a democracy, show how the system is actually oligarchic or manipulative.
   - If the state is based on religion, use religious narratives to show how it has deviated from true spiritual values.
   - If the state relies on economics as a source of legitimacy (e.g. authoritarian capitalism), expose the inequality and exploitation that result.

4. Spread Political Awareness Systematically
   Political education must run parallel to direct action. If change occurs without people's awareness, it will only be replaced by another system that is also oppressive. Form informal political schools and underground discussion spaces if the system suppresses critical discourse.

   Strategies:
   - Use a community-based approach to educate people without directly dealing with the authorities.
   - Develop a political education model that is based on concrete experience, not just academic theory that is far from the reality of the people.
   - If the system prohibits open meetings, use digital strategies and encryption to disseminate materials.

5. Promoting Imbalances That Can Accelerate Crises
   Oppressive systems often require internal stability to survive. One way to hasten their downfall is to create imbalances that accelerate internal contradictions.
   How to do it:
   - Isolate the regime from external resources (e.g., economic or diplomatic pressure if possible).

- Pressure the power elite into conflict with each other, for example by making their interests clear.
- Increase the tension between state claims and reality on the ground, for example through civil disobedience movements that cannot be ignored by the international media.

Examples:

- Movements like Solidarity in Poland that used economic and social pressure to divide the communist elite.
- The Iranian Revolution of 1979 that began with an intellectual and religious movement that eventually weakened the Shah internally.

6. Using Dialectics as an Ideological Weapon
   One way systems survive is by silencing criticism or absorbing opposition into the existing system. How to avoid this:
   - Use dialectics to dismantle the arguments of power, not just to oppose them emotionally.
   - Don't just criticize, offer a clear alternative model.

   Techniques:

   - If the system suppresses criticism with censorship, use allegory, symbolism, or political humor to convey the message without being immediately recognized as a threat.
   - Memes are very effective in revealing contradiction to the masses with a visible influence and virality.
   - If the state tries to accommodate the demands of the opposition (co-optation), show how their changes are actually cosmetic and do not address the root of the problem.

7. Ensure System Change Does Not Give Birth to New Authoritarianism
   - Many revolutions have overthrown old systems but instead have given birth to new forms of oppression. To avoid this:
   - Ensure change is based on awareness, not just spontaneous anger.
   - Use structured-incompleteness mechanisms to prevent the new system from becoming dogmatic and stagnant.
   - Build ongoing evaluation mechanisms so that the new leadership can continue to be criticized and improved.

Conclusion: **Dialectical Revolution, Not Stagnant Chaos**

In Asymptoticism, changes to oppressive systems must occur dialectically and in a measured way. Revolution must not be aimless destruction, but must be directed towards a higher social evolution.

Strategy Summary:

1. Show the contradictions of the system and spread awareness.
2. Form a broad coordinating network.
3. Disrupt the legitimacy of power with ideological strategies.
4. Political education must run parallel to resistance.

5. Create imbalances that accelerate the internal crisis of the system.
6. Use dialectics to attack the narrative of power.
7. Ensure that the new system does not fall into authoritarianism.

With this strategy, change can be accelerated without falling into the illusion of instant revolution that leads to aimless destruction.

VII. Practical Implementation & Political Structure

The Asymptotic Revolution must be structured to prevent stagnation, authoritarianism, and ideological manipulation while maintaining a trajectory toward justice and sustainability. By institutionalizing structured incompleteness, embedding transparency, and ensuring justice remains a non-negotiable foundation, the system can perpetually refine itself without collapsing into chaos or regression.

Key Implementation Strategies:

- Education and Public Awareness – Creating institutions dedicated to dialectical education and systemic refinement.
- Grassroots and Decentralized Governance – Empowering local communities to participate in and influence broader governance structures.
- Technological and Policy Innovation – Leveraging data transparency, AI oversight, and participatory decision-making tools to enhance systemic refinement.
- Regular Global and Local Reviews – Ensuring that the asymptotic approach is continuously applied through structured evaluations at multiple levels.

The goal is not perfection but the perpetual movement toward a more just and sustainable universal order.

A. Avoiding Elitism & Power Consolidation

Transparency, term limits, rotational leadership.

To prevent a self-reinforcing elite from monopolizing power under the guise of awareness, the following mechanisms should be implemented:

- **Regular Evaluations** – Authorities must undergo periodic assessments conducted by independent and rotating bodies to ensure alignment with justice and sustainability.
- **Decentralized Evaluation Panels** – Composed of diverse social, academic, and grassroots groups to prevent ideological homogeneity and power centralization.
- **Public Access to Power Review Data** – Ensuring transparency in governance by making all leadership evaluations and policy impacts publicly accessible.
- **Rotational Leadership and Term Limits** – Preventing stagnation by enforcing periodic changes in leadership roles while maintaining institutional continuity.
- **Clear Separation Between Personhood and Systemic Responsibility** – No ideological justification should absolve individuals from personal responsibility in decision-making.

B. Balancing Stability & Change

Emergency crisis frameworks with dialectical oversight.

In situations requiring immediate action (e.g., climate change, economic collapse), the system must balance long-term dialectical refinement with decisive responses:

- **Hierarchy of Urgency and Importance** – A predefined and publicly vetted framework for addressing urgent matters efficiently without bypassing necessary debate.
- **Emergency Powers with Dialectical Oversight** – A temporary crisis council, composed of representatives from various ideological and social groups, must make rapid decisions while remaining accountable to post-crisis review.
- **Crisis Scenarios Pre-Mapped** – Policies for predictable crises must be established in advance, ensuring swift implementation without the need for ad hoc deliberation.
- **Distributed Crisis Response Mechanisms** – Empowering local governance units to act within predefined parameters in crisis situations to prevent bureaucratic bottlenecks.

C. Enforcing Structural Incompleteness Without Contradiction

To prevent factions from co-opting the system while ensuring its perpetual openness:

- Meta-Clause Against Dogmatism – "No law shall declare itself immune to critique, except the law that no law shall be immune to critique."
- Public Participatory Mechanism – Open forums and citizen-led committees must be institutionalized to ensure continuous dialogue and critique.
- Constitution as a Living Document – The foundational framework must incorporate self-revision mechanisms while maintaining its core commitment to justice and sustainability.
- Regularly Scheduled Constitutional Reviews – A mandated periodic assessment of the constitutional structure by an independent and diverse body.

While the system must accommodate diverse perspectives, it must not fall into relativism that permits injustice under the guise of pluralism:

- **Justice as a Measurable Standard** – Any ideology or policy that systematically leads to oppression or exploitation must be rejected as regressive.
- **Ethical Universals Rooted in Sustainability** – Only those perspectives that align with human dignity, ecological balance, and systemic stability can be sustained within the dialectical process.
- **Emancipation of the Oppressed as a Core Principle** – The revolution's primary function is the continual liberation of marginalized groups, ensuring that justice remains the guiding force of all refinements.
- **Incentivizing Ethical Governance** – Leaders and policymakers must be evaluated on their commitment to justice and sustainability, with mechanisms for removal if they deviate from these principles.

D. Ensuring Dialectical Evolution in Governance

Mandated constitutional reviews.

To safeguard against individuals or groups manipulating the system for self-interest:

- **Absolute Gödellian Constitutional Framework** – While systemic incompleteness is acknowledged, the framework itself must remain protected against removal or perversion.
- **Transparency & Open Deliberation** – Any proposed constitutional changes must undergo rigorous public discourse to prevent hidden authoritarian shifts.
- **Dialectic as a Weapon Against Hypocrisy** – Public engagement in critical analysis must remain at the heart of governance, ensuring ideological inconsistencies are continuously exposed.
- **Independent Ethical Review Bodies** – Panels composed of experts and citizen representatives must oversee policy decisions to prevent systemic abuses.

VIII. Revolutionary Praxis

Revolution in Asymptoticism is not simply the overthrow of a regime or a change of power, but an ongoing dialectical process to destroy illusions and bring society closer to the Universal. Therefore, revolution in Asymptoticism must have a direction, structure, and strategy that ensures that change is not simply replacing old systems with new forms of oppression.

A. Principle of Asymptotic Revolution

1. Revolution as Acceleration of Dialectics
   Revolution is not an end point, but an acceleration of contradictions that forces the system to change faster. No system is final; every revolution must create space for internal criticism and further development.

2. Avoiding Stagnant Chaos Revolution
   Revolution must not fall into anarchy without direction, but must have a mechanism to keep the dialectic going. Revolution that only overthrows the ruler without a structure of criticism of the system will result in regression or stagnation.

3. Targeting Illusions, Not Just Individuals
   The main enemy is not only the ruler, but the illusions that support the legitimacy of the system.
   If only changing leaders without destroying illusions, the revolution will repeat the same cycle (change without development).

4. Preventing Revolutionary Oligarchy
   Successful revolutions often create new ruling classes that end up oppressing in different ways. Therefore, We emphasize structured-incompleteness in the constitution, so that power remains open to criticism.

B. Our Stages of Revolution

(1) Pre-Revolution Phase: Building Consciousness and Coordination

Strategy: Revealing contradictions, building networks, and consolidating opposition forces

a) Identifying Contradictions and Main Targets
Determine the main narrative that can unite various parties (see previous strategy). Target the main illusions that support the legitimacy of the system (e.g., claims of welfare, stability, or democracy).

b) Political Education and Strengthening Consciousness
Use alternative media, underground discussions, and intellectual networks to raise public awareness. Build Revolutionary Political Schools that teach dialectics, strategy, and how to deal with the system.

c) Building Strategic Alliances
Unite dissatisfied labor groups, intellectuals, activists, religious communities, and military elements.
Prevent internal divisions by ensuring there is an understanding of the big goals of the revolution.

The Final Goal of This Phase:

Produce a critical mass ready to create imbalances in the system.

(2) Crisis Acceleration: Forcing systemic contradictions into visibility.

Strategy: Expose the system's contradictions on a large scale so that they can no longer be suppressed by the status quo

(a) Increase Pressure on the System
Use non-confrontational strategies first to force the ruler to show his repressive face. Reveal scandals, raise issues that cannot be repressed without worsening the legitimacy of the system.

(b) Create a Legitimacy Crisis
Encourage mass mobilization with a clear narrative that is not easily co-opted by the old elite.
Ensure that there is an excessive response from the state so that the people increasingly lose trust in the system.

(c) Using Dialectics as an Ideological Weapon
If the state tries to offer cosmetic reforms, show that it is only a strategy to maintain power. If there is an attempt at co-optation by the old elite, reveal the hidden interests behind the compromises offered.

The Final Goal of This Phase:

The system is in crisis that cannot be fixed with shallow reforms.

(3) Transitional Governance: Preventing stagnation or oligarchy post-revolution.

Strategy: Prevent stagnation, avoid co-optation by new elites, and maintain the momentum of transformation

(a) Avoiding Power Vacuums
Power vacuums are often exploited by opportunists or foreign intervention. Ensure that temporary structures remain dialectical and do not fall into new authoritarianism.

(b) Maintaining the Revolution's Direction with Structured-Incompleteness
The post-revolutionary constitution must ensure that the system remains open to evaluation and criticism.
There is no absolute dogma—the structure of government must be designed so that it cannot freeze dialectics.

(c) Avoiding Revision of History by the New Class
Every new regime will try to create a narrative that justifies its existence.
Ensure that the history of the revolution remains open to interpretation and criticism, so that the revolution does not stop in a new dogma.

The Final Goal of This Phase:

Building a new system that is more dynamic and open to criticism without returning to the cycle of oppression.

(4) Continuous Evolution: Ensuring dialectical progress post-reform.

Strategy: Prevent post-revolutionary stagnation and ensure that change continues

1. Dialectics Must Be Institutionalized
   There must be an official mechanism for criticism of the government, not only during the transition period but throughout the history of the new system. The constitution must be designed with structured-incompleteness, so that no absolute certainty can freeze the revolution.

2. Periodic Evaluation of Leadership
   Revolutionary leaders must not have absolute power—they must remain open to criticism and can be replaced if they fail to implement the principles of dialectics. Political schools must continue to operate to ensure the cadre of leaders who are not trapped in new dogmatism.

3. Keeping the Revolution Progressive, Not Just Managing Contradictions
   Revolution is not only about replacing rulers but about continuing to open up space for awareness and social change. If the new system begins to form new

illusions that hinder progress (and it will be), the revolution must correct itself again.

Conclusion: Our Revolution is an Endless Process

Our Revolution is not an end in itself, but an acceleration of dialectics. The main target is not the ruling individual, but the illusions that sustain the oppressive system. After the revolution, the system must remain open to criticism so as not to fall into a new stagnation. Power must always be evaluable, and dialectics must be part of the structure of the system.

C. Uniting Narrative

One of the main challenges in accelerating change is uniting multiple groups with different interests into one grand narrative that is able to effectively accumulate the contradictions of the system. In Our Revolution, the narrative of contradictions must be directed to force the system to react and accelerate the dialectic towards transformation.

---

1. Identifying Universal Contradictions: Finding the Unifying Point
   The first step is to identify the most fundamental systemic contradictions and map them to different interests. These contradictions must:
   - Be fundamental and undeniable, making it difficult for power to accommodate or negate.
   - Intersect multiple interests, so that all groups can see how the contradictions affect them.
   - Be packaged in a simple but powerful narrative, so that it resonates across groups.

   How to Detect Universal Contradictions?

   Ask: What does the system defend most?

   For example, in an authoritarian capitalist system, what is maintained is the illusion of economic stability and political legitimacy.

   Ask: What is the system most afraid of? What does this system Rely on?

   For example, if people realize that they actually have the power to challenge the status quo, then the system fears collective consciousness. An Unjust system always relies on exploitation In some sense: whether Ecological, Economics, Individual, etc. This is because its very system is unsustainable: it is a parasite that relies on exploiting a variable. So sabotaging its oppression would be a threat to the system.

   Ask: What touches different groups the most?

   Example: Corruption and legal injustice can be a unifying narrative that unites the working class, intellectuals, religious groups, and even some marginalized elites.

Examples of Universal Contradiction Narratives in Various Contexts:

Universal	Contradiction	Affected Groups
Economic Authoritarianism	The state claims stability, but poverty increases Working class, small businessmen, middle class	Working class, small businessmen, middle class
Oligarchic Regimes	The state claims democracy, but the people's voice has no influence	Activists, students, intellectuals, civil society
Militarism and Repressive Regimes	The state claims security, but repression increases	Civilians, human rights activists, independent media

2. Determine the Primary Target: What to Attack?
   The target is not just the ruler, but the illusion that supports the ruler's legitimacy.

   Criteria for an Effective Target:
   a. Maintains system stability → If this target is destroyed, the system loses its balance.
   b. Difficult to maintain with the old narrative → If the system has to change the narrative to defend itself, it will accelerate its own crisis.
   c. Unites various groups → The target must be relevant to many parties, not just one particular group.

   Types of Targets That May Be Chosen:
   - The Illusion of Economic Stability
     If the system relies on a narrative of stable economic growth, then show the contradiction between the government's economic claims and the reality of inequality.
     Target: Expose corruption, state debt, labor exploitation, or social crises due to the economy.
   - The Illusion of Democracy and Political Legitimacy
     If the system claims to be democratic but is actually oligarchic, then the target is to expose political manipulation, media co-optation, or repression of the opposition.
     Target: Show how the law only sides with the elite, how political parties are just tools of the oligarchy, how the people's voice never really matters.
   - Illusion of Security and Repression
     If the system defends itself with a security narrative, then show how repression actually creates insecurity for the people.
     Target: Reveal cases of abuse of power by the authorities, show how the system uses fear to control society.
   - What does the system Rely on Most?
     The system must have its core of guarantee, for it to uphold themselves together. That core is the oppression. What does the system abuse most?
     Target: Reveal its weakness and sabotage its oppression if possible.
3. Building Alliances: Uniting Different Interests in One Direction

Different groups have different interests. The main task is to unite them in the same contradictory strategy.

How to Unite Different Groups?

Groups	Their Interest	How to Unite in One Narrative?
Intellectuals	Academic freedom, access to information Show how the system silences the truth	Show how the system silences the truth
Religious Groups	Economic well-being, living wage Show how oligarchs rob them of their rights	Show how the system violates their moral values
Small Businessmen	Fair economic policies Show how the system favors big oligarchs	Show how the system favors big oligarchs
Laborers & Workers	Ethics and social justice Show how the system violates their moral values	Show how oligarchs rob them of their rights

Solution: Create a master narrative that appeals to all parties.
Example:
"The system not only oppresses low-wage workers, it also suppresses intellectuals who want to uncover the truth, corrupts moral values, and makes it difficult for small business people who don't have access to the oligarchy. If we don't act, the system will continue to destroy us all."

4. Creating Trigger Moments: How to Force a Reaction from the System?
   The system often waits until the opposition's momentum has weakened. Therefore, it is important to create a moment that forces the system to overreact.

   How to Trigger Contradiction?

   - Raise Issues That Are Difficult to Suppress → For example, a major scandal that cannot be ignored by the international media.
   - Use Alternative Media to Avoid Censorship → If the mainstream media is controlled, use social media, the dark web, diaspora networks, and symbolic propaganda.
   - Mass Action Based on Awareness, Not Just Anger → Mobilize actions that have a strong narrative so that they are not easily co-opted by the system.

   Example:
   - If the state relies on militarism for repression, then create a moment where repression becomes counterproductive (for example, repression that attracts international attention).
   - If the state relies on economic stability, create pressure that shows how the crisis is happening before our eyes.

   Conclusion: Dialectical Strategy to Unite Resistance

   1. Identify Universal Contradictions → Focus on contradictions that touch all groups.

2. Determine Primary Targets → Attack the illusions that sustain the system, not just the symbols of power.
3. Build Strategic Alliances → Find common interests among different groups.
4. Create Trigger Moments → Force the system to react by creating contradictions they cannot escape.

This strategy ensures that resistance is not just emotional and spontaneous, but dialectical, measured, and directed, thus accelerating change without falling into stagnant chaos or co-optation by foreign powers.

IX. Conclusion

No system, ideology, or institution can fully encapsulate truth—only approach it. Justice is not a static decree but a process of perpetual refinement. Oppression thrives in stagnation; liberation emerges through relentless critique.

We call upon the oppressed, the seekers, and the flawed to embrace the path of Dialectical Asymptoticism—a revolution that never declares itself complete. The struggle against illusion is not won through mere destruction of old systems, but through the continuous evolution of thought, governance, and ethics.

Let no law be immune to critique. Let no power be above refinement. Let no ideology declare itself final. Let not even this manifesto shall declare itself immune to critique, except the law that no law shall be immune to critique; for the rule of incompleteness is a Divine Law.

The falsehoods of stagnant traditions, exploitative systems, and ideological dogmatism must be torn down, not to create new chains, but to keep truth in motion. Justice demands not blind loyalty, but conscious, active engagement. For God is the most high, and His creature can only ever approach Him by His will, never be equal to His Oneness.

We reject the tyranny of finality and embrace structured-incompleteness as the foundation of all progress. Every structure must be open to revision. Every leader must be accountable to critique. Every voice must have the means to grow in awareness.

This is not a revolution of despair, but of infinite possibility. The mirror of human understanding is flawed, but we can refine it. The Universal is unreachable, but we can move toward it.

Rather than Sisyphus endlessly pushing a boulder up a mountain with a fixed peak, we would be far more happier knowing that there is no final limit—only continuous ascent shaped by our own choices. The peak will never trap us, nor will we regress; we'll move forward, forever growing, ever been better, ever been higher.

So Raise the flag of Asymptotic Revolution; for the infinite amount of Progress awaits!